UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

War and Welfare - - - *John Malick*

The Choice Before Us - *Horace Westwood*

Peace: Is There a Way Out of War? - -
- - - - - *Walter G. Bowerman*

The International Peace Garden - - -
- - - - *Helen Kimberly McElhone*

The Philosophy of a Community Church
Pastor - - - - *Cyril K. Richard*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXIII NUMBER 6

Chicago, May 15, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 83
Jottings—J. H. H. 86

ARTICLES—
War and Welfare—JOHN MALICK 86
The Choice Before Us—HORACE WESTWOOD 88
Peace: Is There a Way Out of War?—WALTER G. BOWERMAN .. 90
The International Peace Garden—HELEN KIMBERLY MCELHONE 91
An Unexpected Benediction—FRED W. SHORTER 92
The Philosophy of a Community Church Pastor—CYRIL K. RICHARD 93

POETRY—
Safari to Pacifism—HANNA MOCK 85
Competition—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 95

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Mind—A Verbal Ghost—JULIA N. BUDLONG 94
A French Revolution Drama—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 95

CORRESPONDENCE—
The Case of Miss Banker—O. C. S. 96
A Friendly Complaint—ISAAC F. BAKER 96

THE FIELD—
The Third Choice: Neither War Nor "Appeasement"—*World Federation* 82
Unitarian Summer Services in New York 96
Young People's Conference 96

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Third Choice: Neither War Nor "Appeasement"

International relations have been on everyone's tongue and in everyone's mind from the time of the Munich settlement to the recent dismembering of Czechoslovakia. The opportunity has come to obtain a hearing for proposals of world-wide scope. While our intelligentsia expresses confusion in blind pessimism, most people welcome ideas on what to do about it.

Whether through accident or design, American leadership has remained split by the old controversy between "neutrality" and "collective security." There has been little challenge to the old illusion that nationalism, military force and alliances bring security. For twenty years the Czechs relied on an efficient army, strong fortifications, and their French Alliance. All of these were ineffective after the breakdown of the slight measure of international order achieved under the League of Nations. The blame for that breakdown must be shared by the governments in power in the nations that won the war and consistently used the League as a means of protecting and advancing their own national interests when they might have allowed it to come under closer control of the people and helped it to act in the interests of the whole world. Black indeed would be the world's fate if the only alternatives were war or a continual yielding to threats of force. This is the time to press another alternative, the only one that builds for the future: the establishment of a true Federation of Nations through which the peoples of the world may at last get a square deal.

The reception of the Munich agreement shows that the people are prepared to make drastic sacrifices of national sovereignty for the sake of peace. How much more willing they will be to transfer a part of their national sovereignty to a democratic, all-inclusive non-military federation of nations, not as a sacrifice of justice, but as a means of establishing justice!

Isn't this the aggressive but peaceful answer of democracy to the increasing threat of dictatorship? With the modern development of science, transport and communications, the world is overripe for some federation of the peoples for their common interests, leaving national autonomy intact in cultural and internal matters. Shall democracy stand idly by and leave Fascism or Communism the job of uniting the world in their way? Let democracy take the initiative or sink into oblivion!

For everyone who has the vision of a warless world, now, if ever, is the time to take action.

—*World Federation Now*

Official Organ of the Campaign for World Government, 455 Birch Street, Winnetka, Illinois.

(*Continued on page* 96)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIII MONDAY, MAY 15, 1939 No. 6

OVER THE DOORS OF WAR OFFICES

In 1790, Dr. Benjamin Rush, famous physician, and signer of the Declaration of Independence, suggested that the following inscriptions be painted over the doors of war offices:

—An office for butchering the human species
—A widow-and-orphan-making office
—A broken-bone-making office
—A wooden-leg making office
—An office for creating private and public vices
—An office for creating public debt
—An office for creating profiteers and bankrupts
—An office for creating famine
—An office for creating political diseases
—An office for creating poverty and the destruction of liberty and national happiness.

HITLER'S REPLY

Chancellor Hitler's reply to President Roosevelt threw the whole world into debate, which is infinitely better than into battle. In this sense the President's original appeal has achieved success. It has prolonged discussion, and thus postponed war. One thing else is not so pleasant—and that is the vast embarrassment of Hitler's recital of the wrongs suffered by Germany at Versailles and after, and of his assertion that having disarmed once and been betrayed, Germany did not propose to disarm again. What's the answer to that, except the righting of Germany's wrongs through a complete and voluntary liquidation of the Versailles Treaty? But that's the very thing that President Roosevelt offered the Fuehrer in his original message asking a pledge of non-aggression preliminary to conference. We're getting on! Let the debate continue! War gets more unlikely as it becomes more ridiculous. We don't know and can't guess what will happen between the writing and the publishing of this note, but we are gambling that it will all be in the interest of peace.

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

"As things are at the moment, the most we can hope for any policy is that it will postpone the outbreak of a world war. For it is only by postponing and postponing and postponing war itself that there is any chance whatever of creating the conditions, the atmosphere, and the will for anything resembling a genuine peace settlement." Walter Lippman, in the New York *Herald-Tribune.*

In this statement, which we believe to be profoundly true, lies the justification of everything that has happened in international affairs from the Munich settlement to this present hour. We said as much when Mr. Chamberlain flew to Berchtesgarten, and we said as much again on the more recent occasion of Mr. Roosevelt's remarkable letter of appeal to the dictators. Anything to push off the war a year, six months, even a month! Peace, if it comes, is going to be won not by preparedness, and threats of arms, and force and violence, least of all by fighting for it, but rather by the set of the public mind against war. Reason, good will, conference, and the mobilization of the conscience and will of the people in all countries—these and these alone are the methods which can save the world from a final catastrophe. And these take time! Hence is it worth-while, at any price, to postpone any outbreak of hostilities, that time may be gained. There is no reason, let it be said, why we should be impatient, or imagine that we are failing if we do not insure peace immediately. Says Walter Lippman, again:

> The war, if it breaks out, might go on for several years. If we are realistic, we shall understand that the campaign to prevent war will probably last some years. . . . As long as war is averted, the President's move is not a failure.

We would put it more strongly—the President's move, like Chamberlain's before him, is a success. We note no suggestion of any alternative. Critics of the President, as of Chamberlain at Munich, either accuse him of a conspiracy of self-advantage, which is preposterous, or argue that war is inevitable and we had better plunge into it right away, which is a fatalistic counsel of despair. Postponing war is the one sure way of preventing war. Let's keep on this road!

LET'S GET AWAY FROM IT ALL!

It's amazing—the number of people who want to get away from all this troubled world, and take measures for doing so. The suicide is of course the man who acts effectively—he presents the perfect pattern of escape. But there are other methods which approximate to this drastic method, and themselves constitute forms of spiritual suicide. There are the religious cults, for example, which flourish in cataclysmic days like these, just as they flourished in the days of the decline and fall of Rome. These cults attract multitudes of people who ask for nothing quite so much as to be soothed by the calm assurance that God is all, and that therefore all is well. In these cult meetings

the events of the outer world are as completely forgotten as though they were not occurring at all. Their worship is like the opium-eater's trance—the dream and vision of unreality. Another escape from realization and responsibility is entertainment. As the terrors of the world increase, so increase the jazz-hounds, the jitter-bugs, the movie-fans, and the bridge-fiends. All of these frenzied folk are trying to escape—and so they deliberately slay every serious side of their natures, that only the flippant may remain. Still another escape is that of the sentimentalist who makes himself impervious to greater shocks by absorbing himself in some triviality close at hand. We found such a specimen in New York the other day—a woman who, untouched by Spain, China, Czechoslovakia, the Jews, became all wrought up over the imprisonment of "Dixie" Davis, a corrupt lawyer mixed up in the Hines racket case. This woman wanted us to stop everything else, and get "Dixie" Davis' sentence reduced. This was her way, more or less unconscious, of escaping from the challenge of a world in travail. The colleges, of course, are a champion escape for the members of the younger generation, most of whom know little or nothing of what is going on in the world at large. "Bright college years" constitute a transference of attention from things that really matter. To "get away from it all" is the passion of myriads of souls. But there are people in Europe, in Asia—in Madrid, Prague, Memel, Vienna, Shanghai—who are finding that they *cannot* get away from it all. Why should any of us *want* to get away from it all, when a world is in the balance, civilization at stake, and the Kingdom of God in final hazard?

WORKS OF ART IN TRANSIT

When the *S. S. Paris* was burned at her pier in Havre, it was at first reported that famous art treasures, en route to the New York World's Fair, had been destroyed in the flaming hold of the stricken vessel. Later it was announced that most of the precious crates had been removed in time, and the insurance placed upon them was named. This insurance business strikes us as funny—for if an immortal painting or statue is destroyed, what compensation is there in we care not how many thousands of dollars? It reminds us of Mr. Villard's story of Henry Flagler in his autobiography, *Fighting Years*. Visiting at Mr. Flagler's summer home on a certain occasion, Mr. Villard was astonished to find many of the millionaire's great collection of paintings hanging on the walls of his cottage. He asked if these were the same canvases that belonged to his art gallery in his winter residence in New York. Mr. Flagler said they were, and told of how he transported them back and forth each year in a specially designed steel car. Mr. Villard expressed some concern as to the risk involved. "O, no," said Mr. Flagler, "they're all insured!" As though insurance could replace anything of this nature once destroyed, or even damaged! It all raises the question as to whether priceless works of art should be transported from place to place, and thus subjected to the numerous hazards of land and sea, fire, water, and theft. The argument of course is that few persons can travel, and great masterpieces, like Mahomet's mountain, may well be taken to those who cannot otherwise behold them. But buildings and landscapes cannot be transported—if we are to see the Parthenon, the Taj Mahal, the Pyramids, the Alps, the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, we must go where these are. Why, therefore, should paintings and statuary and manuscripts be toted about, just because they are movable? After all, it was Mahomet in the end who came to the mountain, not the mountain to Mahomet! The only transportation of art objects which we have ever really approved was the carrying of the treasures of Madrid and Barcelona out of Spain and into France, to escape the ravages of the civil war. In the next war, if it comes, there will be a movement of art objects, we imagine, to match the flight of refugees. But this is one of the horrors of war, not to be perpetuated and practised, we should think, in peace times. All in all, this question is perplexing. We should like to hear some expert testimony.

WHAT'S HAPPENING TO THE RADIO?

Are we wrong in our judgment that the radio this winter has been reaching a new "low" of boredom and imbecility? The radio started, and continued in the early days, at so low a level that it would seem an impossible feat to fall any lower. Perhaps our comparison should be not with the whole history of radio, but with recent years when real progress was being made. Whether or no, programs this season seem to be so terrible as to be well-nigh incredible. What the radio can do when it is on its mettle, and has no advertising sponsorships to bother with, was shown conclusively in the unforgettable days of the European war-crisis in September last. That was a record which will not be beaten for a long time to come. Special features on the regular weekly programs are not to be forgotten—the Toscanini concerts, for example, the Town Meeting of the Air, "Information Please," and certain others known to all discriminating listeners. But the "run of the mine" features—the jazz, the comedy acts, the serial stories, the plays, the innumerable question and quiz hours—these pass all description of inanity. Is it possible that there are audiences for this stuff? If so, is there any measure of the range and depth of the sheer unintelligence of the so-called public mind? In assessing responsibility, we cannot seem to think it just to blame the station managers, who put on high class programs "on their own." The real

blame, we must believe, lies with the advertisers, who, judging by their sales talks, are fixed in their opinion that the great mass of radio listeners are not merely children, but actual morons. But why should not the managers be held responsible for their advertisers? How can great stations, like those in the National and Columbia systems, stand for the goo-goo material that goes flooding out on to the air hour after hour for weeks and months without end? The British Broadcasting Company has a standard of taste as well as of propriety for its features. Is this because in England there is no advertising, and the management therefore is held to direct accountability? We do not know, but this we assert—that, if this present degradation of a great utility goes on, there will soon be something like a popular uprising in the interest of self-respect.

EZRA POUND

Ezra Pound, poet and poseur, has just returned from his boasted self-exile for a little visit to his despised native land, and the newspapers have been giving him a lot of space. We wonder why! Not one newspaper reader in a hundred thousand, we imagine, has ever heard this expatriate's name, nor one in a million ever read a line of his extrovert writings, nor one in ten million cared a fig about either the man or his words. UNITY has as intelligent a family of readers as any magazine in this country, yet we doubt if one per cent of these readers know a line of anything Ezra Pound has ever written. He obtained a prize once from the *Dial,* a paper as queer as himself, and a few of his more intelligible verses have found their way into some of our modern anthologies. But as an occasion of public interest, either now or in the future, Ezra Pound seems to us to be as near nil as any man alive. Yet the papers toot his horn as though his own exalted opinion of himself were true, thus proving that American newspapers, just like the Americans of whom Barnum spoke, love nothing quite so much as to be fooled. The measure of Pound's mind may be found in his statement, vouchsafed to reporters on his landing in New York recently, that Italy is today the cultural center of the Occident. This is because Ezra Pound lives there, we presume—though we notice that his new poems (so-called) were brought here to America for publication! It would be interesting to test Pound's encomium of Mussolini's land by asking for some evidence of great literature and great art produced there in recent years. For the Duce, the exotic Ezra has unbounded admiration, and grovels like the literary sycophants of old Rome before Augustus Caesar. Pound, after all, is a perfect part of his own picture. Behold the fine flower of our Fascist world! For ourself we must confess a feeling of infinite relief that this fawning and fatuous penman had in his pocket, when he set foot upon these shores, a return ticket to Italy.

TEMPLES OF RELIGION

These Temples of Religion (so-called) at the New York and San Francisco Fairs have "got us going," as our readers must have noticed. They are such a revelation of what people these days apparently think religion is! What is religion anyway—and what should a temple of religion enshrine? Well, at San Francisco they seem to imagine that religion means Bibles—so they have a first-edition exhibition of St. James translations. At New York they are obsessed with the idea of music—that religion means soft strains of harmony from invisible organ pipes. Also singers and instrumentalists on special occasions! New York is also to have rabbis, ministers and priests on duty to receive and talk with visitors—a kind of glorified Travelers Aid service for those who want to find their way to heaven. At both Fairs, also, there are to be services at which a combination of music, soft lights, and ritual readings may waft the souls of listeners to far-away spaces where the troubles of this world are no more. These things are religion—and, O yes, we nearly forgot, some carillons to be rung at appointed hours from aloft! It seems all like a sweet and gentle dream. But if this is religion, then UNITY is the *Police Gazette.* Try to fit Amos into this kind of a setting! Ask what John the Baptist would do with such folderol! As for Jesus, would he not feel about as much at home in such temples, as he did in another temple which he saw once in Jerusalem? Before these Fairs are over, we hope that some one will rise up in these Temples at San Francisco and New York and speak one shattering word of truth. Such a word might silence the music and jangle the bells and rustle the Bible leaves, and frighten out of their wits the mooning ministrants who are the only humans, apparently, who are expected to seek these shrines, but might teach us somewhat of God. Once also we should like to see swarming into these Temples some multitudes of common folk such as heard Jesus gladly in his day. The crowds would probably muddy the floors and disturb the stillness, and make a mess of things generally, but they would give a touch of reality now woefully lacking. For religion is only incidentally art, and primarily *life*—the life of men in toil and tears and blood.

Safari to Pacifism

The narrow winding upward road
To which my spirit soars
Has carried me above the lanes
Of thunder of the wars.

I struggle on, the peak in sight
Upward to the sun!
I see my goal. I stand there now—
A lonely battle won.

HANNA MOCK

Jottings

It has always seemed to us a peculiarly terrible thing that in the book of *Revelation* in the New Testament, in the enumeration of the merchandise for sale in "Babylon, that mighty city," there appears, after the gold, and silver, and precious stones, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all manner of vessels, the last dreadful item, *"and souls of men."* The souls of men for sale, then—as now!

One thing we cannot understand is why these movie stars, in their adventures in sexual promiscuity, ever bother to get married. Why make necessary the nuisance of divorce? Is this to be regarded as a kind of last contemptuous salute to a venerated custom?

> "'I would gladly sacrifice my two sons if we were to go to war now,' stated the kindly woman-doctor in a deliberate tone to the writer."—*The Idealist* (March-April, 1939)

Who gave this woman the right to sacrifice her sons? How long since sons have been mere bullocks to be laid on the altar at the whim of a woman who chances to be a mother? Let the sons be consulted. What do *they* say?

A recent Gallup Poll showed that 81 per cent of the voters who voted for Roosevelt in 1936 would vote for Garner in 1940 if Garner should receive the Democratic nomination. What kind of conviction have these voters got? Or, for that matter, what kind of intelligence?

The modern George Washington, traveling from Mount Vernon to the New York World's Fair, abandoned his coach and journeyed at last on a 50-mile an hour bus, to the confusion and disillusionment of schoolchildren all along the way. The original George was made of sterner stuff!

That indispensable little paper, *World Events,* Devere Allen, Editor, is shifting its editorial base from this country to Europe. Evidently making sure of a front seat for whatever is going to happen in the continental arena!

J. H. H.

War and Welfare

JOHN MALICK

We belong to a number of organizations doing some kind of good. We serve on the Boards, attend their committees and meetings. Every year we are more and more impressed with the futility of much that we are doing, until we get rid of war, for by no possibility can we move a step on from here in anything until we get through with this thing. It will sink us, and that is not theory, just simple mathematics, unless we sink it.

There is not much encouraging to say about war. We gather up the crumbs of comfort and wish they were a loaf. On the credit side, it may be said that much of the social flair of war has gone out. War had the distinction of being of the leisure class, the proud chief with his picked braves whose only part was war. They would not do any other kind of work and would not have called it work. From the early tribe to the last nation, war always has been socially correct. In war a man could show his parts, his skill, prowess, how he could handle the lance, draw the bow, and sit his horse. It always was the place to show what you can do that men envy and women admire. A soldier in the trenches now with mud, lice, and rats is not the attractive conquering male showing off in a pleasant form of sport that he was when he rode a charger, unhorsed his opponent, not quite sure whether it was war or a society event. When war ceased to be sport with horses, only a little more hazardous than polo, much of the social flair went out. It is harder now to show off your parts, and get enough notice for any kind of distinction, when the farm boy from Kansas, who went to the technical school, can get the range, press the button, and do more damage than a whole company of knights with their long sticks.

But the great change is war passing from a local thing to all the territory there is. War until now has been something that went on only where the army happened to be, and it could be in only one place. You picked a nice open space and said, "You who are not to be in this fight, stand back out of range, or you might get hit." Or, it was out on the water with no other life endangered except the fishes and the gulls. War did not disturb those not in the neighborhood. Those who were writing books went on, without much inconvenience, surprisingly near the most deadly of the old form of battle. The pleasant days are over when you announced where the match was to be held and where it was safe to put the grandstand for those who looked on.

War has passed from a local to a universal thing. The most significant condition of the World War was that it was the first of the new kind. To get in was no credit, it being impossible to stay out. You are bound to be affected anyway. You might as well be in and defend to your limit, for you are bound to be in. Protected zones, permitted lanes of travel, all the interminable talk of yesterday about where and what can be sold and carried, trade by land and sea, all about noncombatants—these were all just swept off the earth. You may burn all the books about safe places for the women, children, the old and the sick. The books will not be needed again. "Non-combatant," is out of the vocabulary. In time no one will know what the word meant. All the countries that really are preparing for

war now are building cellars to crawl into. About the only certainty is that they will be needed. War has a new dimension; it has gone from the bottom and sides to the top. Walls do not help, however high or thick, nor guns, however long the range. Things are just dropped down by these new sky pilots from the direction only God and Heaven were thought to be in all wars before.

The great, slow change is that those in the ranks want to know whose war it is, why, who is staging it, and what for. Now, they want to know where they are going and what they get. War now requires a closed and regulated system of rationing knowledge to easily receptive minds. War requires a people who are told little, believe it all and nothing else. It is increasingly difficult to keep your people from knowing what all intelligent people know about war, that it is pretty much of a shell-game in which the players are many and the winners few. To support war now, in the face of what you get from it, nothing but the bills, requires the kind of mind that plays shell-games at country fairs, buys City Hall of a stranger, and gives his money to a new acquaintance to hold. You have to clamp down pretty tight on the channels of information to build up a military people.

It would be a really perilous situation for war if all the countries knew as much about it as is in circulation now in this country and in the British Empire. You would have a lot of trouble to make war if all your bright youth should decide against being in it, and all labor refused to make and carry. It is difficult to show an intelligent man just the advantages accruing to him from anybody's war. He is getting deeply skeptical and has to be shown, and the facts at present are not available to show him. In free countries, where they still elect, it will not be long until those cannot be elected who would not vote for the rule that no one shall make profit out of war, that all shall be conscripted right down to the skin. When you do that, take the profit out, make all lose together, and lose only, there will be many patriots who will not be so easily insulted, nor so sensitive about their country's honor. Just what the effect of getting into the air will be, is not yet evident. On the debit side is dropping things from the air to explode *on* people's heads. On the credit side is dropping things *in* their heads to explode there. Just how long can these winged words be kept out by countries that give their own sorted stuff to their people?

Nothing has affected our minds in quite the same way as this backstage view we have been getting. Our minds have been made on war matters by our own national traditions and our own wars, which, as wars go, did have some justification, a free country and free blacks, and such. It is a pretty much idealized thing with us, our own country, our own people, rocks, rills, and native hills, democracy, unshackled slaves. It was all a Sir Galahad, pure knight, God-blessed crusade kind of thing in which all lost and died to free somebody. We are a highly sentimental people who take to moral issues like ducks to water. You just cannot get over to our people that war is anything less than the supreme sacrifice of all good men and true, going out for some high and holy issue for which men ought gladly to die, and will if you ask them. War memories have been potent with us, making not only our Memorial Days but also our Presidents for a long time, and our national budget.

Until now we have lived for, moralized, sentimentalized over, and paid for war as something that you do for your own people and your own high ends. The most terrible thing was to give aid and comfort to the enemy. That was treason and you got shot, and properly shot. We realized slowly that there are people who have no country, no loyalty to any one people but who live on making things to fight with on a vast scale, a vast network of interrelated corporations with huge capital and profit. We are not prepared to be told that warmaking is a business with its own publicity department for making supporting opinion. To all innocents, all these differences between Frenchmen, Germans, Poles, Greeks, and Rumanians are real differences; all their wars crusades for liberty, or something fine like that.

Front stage in Europe, for public consumption, is fierce nationalism that shoots as spy and traitor anyone who passes anything across the line, and backstage, a real internationalism that passes anything across any line without distinction, all customers and friends, and no enemies. It would be fine if all who have to be kept playing that they are enemies, could come to be large and magnanimous like that. What gives pause now is this friendly interchange of weapons among those we understood were bitter enemies. No mother need fear having her son go to war now in any one of the larger countries. There will be a home touch about it wherever he goes. Every mother, and mother's son, may have the satisfaction now that boys will look into the muzzles of, and be killed by, guns from their dear native land, made and sent over before to welcome them when they arrive. As soon as any country gets a new trick, by which it might win in the next holy crusade it enters, it is sold across lines and its own men face the fire of its own superior weapons in the enemies' hands. You could not stage a war in any part of the world today in which Americans, or Englishmen, or Frenchmen, or Germans, or Poles, or Swiss, and Belgians would not be killed, with things from their own countries.

We are thinking how it would liven up the history class, brought up on Grant's Memoirs and McKinley's crusade to rescue Cuba, to put in some of this new history about war. We are thinking of how it would liven up the missionary society meeting to put in a little of this new realism, that when we go out to meet those heathen in Asia, in the next war, we shall face not only the Christians our funds have saved from perdition, but also we shall face the arms made in every country that ever sent a missionary to Asia. It would interest us tremendously if the churches in their national gatherings would break down their accounts with the East to see just how much of the money made selling arms to Asia went back as missionary funds.

One of the results of war is that you have your dead soldiers as a memory and your live soldiers as a difficulty. It always has been so, as long as there have been soldiers demobilized. They have played a large part in government for these thousands of years. Individually just as good as the average, or better, they always have been easily responsive to leadership that capitalizes the story of their sacrifice and their wrongs. It is one of those highly sentimentalized things that you cannot reach and regulate, that for centuries has made and unmade governments and held up the treasuries of nations. The asset of having an army large enough to take over another country is balanced always by the liability that it is large enough to take over its own country. The presence of a large, demobilized soldier population always has given concern to republics.

When you take all the cost items of war, the prep-

aration, the war itself, the after-years, the demands of soldiers as long as there is a remote descendant left, you reach a total so staggering that you have to choose between war and human welfare. There is not enough property in the world to finance both. Any one who works in these various human uplift things comes to one conclusion, that we are just dabbling around the edges and building to no end. It is difficult for an intelligent person now to put enthusiasm into saving babies and building youth, at one end with starving budgets, volunteer work, and holy zeal, while, at the other end, they are sacrificed either on the field in war, or to the burden of war-cost in peace. War, on the scale we now have in preparation, simply cancels welfare. To lift people to life is a worthy end but only if they are going to have life after you lift them there.

You hardly ever see anyone in any kind of human welfare work who is not in some anti-war movement. One going into welfare work ought to be that bright. It is the sense that welfare always must be a starved thing with Mars sitting at the board with his rapacious and capacious maw. It is the sense of futility and stupidity, belonging to a race so dumb that all building up at one end is just nullified at the other. War is just one of those few basic, down-under-everything-else sort of things that we have to do something about before we possibly can get on. As long as we use as much as we are using now to blow up the foundation, welfare work never can be more than just gathering up the pieces. Likely there never were as many fine babies and youth in the world, certainly never in Europe, and Mars will get them if there is not some quick work changing the purpose for which they are so tenderly nursed and so carefully nurtured into form. Welfare will always have the hollow sound it has with us, as long as it has to build at one end to furnish victims for war at the other end, calling for still more welfare as tender and as futile.

The Choice Before Us

HORACE WESTWOOD

If I had any power at my command, I would make a thorough study of *Mein Kampf* a required course in every high school, college, and university in the United States and in all the democracies. Adolf Hitler may not be a master of literary style, but his book is among the three most important volumes in the history of modern thought. Though not great in character, it ranks in power of influence with Darwin's *Origin of Species* and Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*. When the historian comes to write about our era, he will point to its philosophy, more than to any other, as responsible for the map of the world eventuating from the present political world crisis. Not since the early part of the sixteenth century, when Machiavelli wrote *The Prince* has there appeared such a complete philosophy of statecraft for those who rule by the will of power.

I shall not attempt to review it, however, for since it is nearly 1,000 pages in length that would be impossible in one discourse. I simply give my reactions to some of its leading principles in their relation to the topic of the hour. I begin by repeating that the book cannot be treated lightly. Had responsible statesmen regarded it seriously, they would have had before them an outline of Hitler's political program and policies and they might have prevented the developments of recent years. Nevertheless, I am not so much concerned with it from the angle of political prophecy, but as a statement of a philosophy of life. This is by far its most serious aspect. For Adolf Hitler does not bring into focus something new in the history of humanity but reëmphasizes a view of life which in all centuries has sought dominion over the minds of men. He revitalizes and reincarnates a theory of existence which again and again has captivated the imagination of nations and which today, as perhaps in no former period, is making a bid for dominion over the heart of mankind.

But he does more than this. He throws down the gauntlet to every ideal which the world has associated with the Christian faith. If the philosophy of *Mein Kampf* should triumph—and it is by no means a foregone conclusion that it will not—there will be no Christianity! For let us not deceive ourselves. At bottom Mr. Hitler has no more love for the Christian than he has for the Jew. The Jew looks upon the Fuehrer as the supreme embodiment of anti-Semitism. But if everything that is opposed to the Christian point of view and the Christian outlook upon life could be expressed in terms of one person, I would point to Adolf Hitler. Indeed, if I were a Fundamentalist instead of a Liberal, I would have no hesitation in saying that he is the long-expected anti-Christ prophesied in centuries past as the great scourge of the nations.

Be this as it may, we have in his volume a view of life with which there can be no temporizing, and the choice before our modern world is the great question as to whether it will bow to the philosophy symbolized by the Sword of Hitler, or give itself in heartfelt devotion to those values symbolized by the Cross of Christ. This is the alternative confronting our civilization—not alone the governments of the nations, but the hearts and minds of individuals like ourselves. And I want to say that this great alternative is inescapable. The decision is before us, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's."

The choice is very definite, for as I read *Mein Kampf* and compare it with the Gospels I am impressed with the absolutisms which both contain. Hitler, no less than Jesus, demands the united loyalty of the whole man. Both insist upon the uncompromising devotion of the entire person. Both insist that an individual cannot be half one thing and half another. "No man can serve two masters . . . Ye cannot serve God and Mammon!"—cries Jesus, even as he exclaims, "He that loveth father and mother more than me is not worthy of me." Similarly, Hitler maintains that one cannot be loyal to the German State and humanity at the same time, and one cannot share his devotion to the Germanic race with devotion to any humanitarian ideal. The German race must be made absolutely pure, therefore absolutely ruthless in purging out all racial admixtures and thoroughly contemptuous in relation to all other peoples. Naziism can permit no compromise with any other movement and the slightest toleration of anything associated with the democratic ideal is the worst possible treason. Note these words:

> The future of a movement is conditioned by the fanaticism, even more the intolerance, with which its adherents present it as the only right one, and enforce it in the face of all other formations of a similar kind.

To paraphrase the message of Jesus concerning the laws by which men shall live, Hitler would say:

> Thou shalt love thy Fuehrer with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind and with all thy strength. And thou shalt love thy fellow Nazi as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

Indeed, Hitler arrogates to himself the spirit of the first two commandments in the decalogue, and would exclaim:

> Thou shalt have no other Gods before me. For I, thy Leader, am a jealous leader visiting the disloyalties and the compromises of the fathers upon the children, even unto the third and fourth generation.

And in his service anything is justified—force, unmeasured and without stint—brutality and cruelty without compassion—persecution and oppression to the utmost limit—treachery, lying and betrayal—and if it should come to pass that the world shall be plunged into war and the earth deluged with rivers of blood, what does it matter provided his will is absolute and his dreams of domination are fulfilled?

In order that we may see more fully the nature of the choice before us, let us analyze its character in greater detail.

Naziism has for its major thesis the doctrine of the superior race with its right to dominion over all other races. Christianity denies all theories of superior races and confidently proclaims the doctrine of brotherhood with its concomitant of the equal rights of all people to the possession of the earth. Naziism builds its whole psychology upon the love of power. Christianity condemns in theory the love of power and offers as its great alternative the power of love. Naziism exalts the State and its service as the highest of all ideals. Christianity sees in the State simply an instrument subject under God for the service of man. Naziism sees in the individual merely a means to an end —namely the glorification of the nation. Christianity sees in the individual an end in himself and insists that nations exist in order that the individual may attain greater fullness of life. Naziism worships force and glorifies military power as its supreme expression, hence it believes in war as a method of achieving its desires. Christianity despises force as unworthy of the human spirit, hence it cannot glorify military power and regards all war as a degradation of man. Naziism ruthlessly insists that the conscience of the individual must be the will of the State. Christianity uncompromisingly asserts that conscience in the last analysis may surrender to no earthly power—it is subject only to spiritual power—the Will of God.

Here, then, in sharp antithesis are the alternatives.

Race and nation, versus humanity and brotherhood. Power and dominion, versus mutual service and good will. The supremacy of the State, versus the glory of human life. The will of the nation, versus the liberty of the individual. The authority of the State, versus the rights of conscience. The glorification of force, versus the exaltation of moral and spiritual power. War as an instrument of national policy, versus confidence in the ideal and methods of peace. The right of might, versus the might of right. Supremacy regardless of justice, versus equality and justice. The love of power, versus the power of love. The doctrine that the end justifies any means, no matter how treacherous and vile, versus the conviction that no purpose is justified unless truth is served, for truth will prevail.

I am perfectly well aware that to a greater or lesser extent these alternatives have always been before the world. Naziism, Fascism, and Hitlerism are merely new names for tendencies as old as society itself. In one form or another, as Bertrand Russell points out in a recent volume, the struggle for power has ever been present. So also have the ideals that we now identify with Christianity. The sword of Hitler versus the Cross of Christ represents and symbolizes an eternal conflict in the heart of man.

What Mr. Hitler in his *Mein Kampf* has done, is simply to give them focus and to call our attention to the fact that the issues now are sharply defined.

As I face the entire situation, however, I find myself in a curious frame of mind. For instance, I find myself wanting to do the easiest thing possible in the present juncture, and to follow the path of least resistance. That is, I find myself wanting to join in the universal condemnation of Mr. Hitler and all his works, and to unite in the universal clamor—"Hitler must be destroyed! Hitlerism must be overthrown! Naziism and Fascism must be stopped!" Well, I do join in this universal condemnation and in this clamor I hear on every hand. I do so, I imagine, because I sense an emergency and share the psychology of crisis. The emergency must be met. The crisis must be resolved. But we have before us a far more difficult task, namely to repent of our own sins and shortcomings and to begin with an examination of our own hearts.

Germany, under Hitler, repudiates equality and brotherhood, but what nation under heaven is guiltless of this sin? Germany, under Hitler, is merely being consistent, it is practicing what it has preached. The Great Powers have preached equality and brotherhood but in practice—without exception—every one of them has denied it. Not one of the so-called Christian nations, for example, when opportunity presented itself has refrained from exploiting the so-called backward races. And while on the one hand they have sent missionaries on errands of mercy and healing, on the other they have adopted the policy "Trade follows the flag" and behind the flag there have been the battleships and the big guns.

Brotherhood and equality? Condemnation of the doctrine of a chosen people and a superior race? Yet a negro singer with an international reputation was recently denied the right to sing in a public hall in the Nation's capital and there are hotels and resorts all over the nation from which Jews and Negroes are alike debarred. Again, under the Kellogg pact—now, it is to be feared, merely a scrap of paper—we have joined with other powers in the repudiation of war as an instrument of national policy. Yet in the name of trade and profits, Christian nations have trafficked in death and by various devices have supplied credit and munitions for the slaughter of the innocent in China and Spain.

So it is with regard to every so-called Christian virtue. Go through the list of everything for which the name of Christ stands, and it will be discovered, to quote ancient scripture, that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." The Sword of Hitler versus the Cross of Christ? Yes, this is the issue right enough, but that sword has been forged on the anvil of the hypocrisy and the iniquitous inconsistency of the Christian world, and the issue will never be decided on fields of battle, it can only be decided in our hearts.

All this brings me to the thought I wish to leave with you. Earlier I spoke of the absolutism both of Hitler and of Christ. Both I said demanded all. Hitler's absolute demand, I am persuaded, is the secret of his power—particularly over German youth. Without reservation and without compromise he demands all. "Give me everything you have," he declares, "and see where I will lead you!" Before German youth he portrays a dream of glory. With glowing eloquence, he appeals to the great virtues—courage, industry, thrift; devotion, sacrifice, self-denial; self-discipline, personal purity, consecration; a willingness to endure hardship and a willingness to die if needs be—that the nation may be glorified. Make no mistake about it, he makes heroic appeal.

The fact of the matter is that Naziism, like Fascism, is a religion. It takes hold of the imagination with all the power of a religious appeal. In contrast, our Christianity, in all too many instances, has ceased to be a religion! It has become only a formal profession clothed in garments of respectability. Therefore, while we see the dangers of Mr. Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, I submit that we shall combat them only by accepting his challenge to become really Christian. What, in effect, Hitler really says to our modern world is this: "If you meet me only with the sword, I am still victorious even if you defeat me, for I have compelled you to take up the sword and admit its power; therefore my thesis is justified!" For this is the curious paradox running throughout the unexpurgated translation of the book—in fact it has surprised me again and again—Mr. Hitler concedes that in the long run the spirit decides. And I am convinced that his contempt for Christianity rests on the fact that the Christian world has not yet dared to be Christian!

Therefore, as I finished the perusal of *Mein Kampf*, these were the words I heard:

> If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life shall find it.

And I saw, as never before, that between what Mr. Hitler and all that the name of Christ stands for, there can be no final compromise.

Whatever may be the practical steps necessary in the field of international relations in order to meet the immediate crisis, they will prove ultimately futile unless there is a fundamental inward change. The world will be deceived if it permits itself to be led into believing that the situation is simply a military crisis to be decided by an overwhelming balance of military power. Likewise, if it deems, it can be settled by bargaining for territory and material resources. The issue will never be met finally apart from the acceptance of a different philosophy of life.

Which way humanity? The way of the struggle for supremacy and power? The way of the sword? This is the answer of *Mein Kampf* and it means the destruction of humanity. The way which seeks fulfilment for the whole of mankind? The way which says, "I will give without counting the cost. I am among you as one that serveth"? This is the way of the Cross and, strange as it may seem, it is the way of life.

Peace: Is There a Way Out of War?

WALTER G. BOWERMAN

It has been said that the two greatest problems before the world are poverty and war. These have been with us for many centuries. Today, however, a solution of the poverty question is generally agreed to be within the sight of ordinary men. Experts in economics and politics agree that under modern conditions there is no reason why any sane person should starve to death. There are plenty of materials and there is a general good will that they shall be so distributed that none shall suffer want. There is much room for improvement in the practical administration of this distribution. Yet the solution is in sight and meets with the reasoned approval of civilized people everywhere.

On the other hand, the problem of war and peace is today further from solution than at any time in human history. The early savage tribes did not wage organized war to any extent. In many cases of intertribal battle, it was provided that hostilities would cease as soon as one person on either side became wounded. This was deemed sufficient to satisfy the honor aroused by the occasion. This historical background has been cited as illustration that war is not a native instinct of humankind. It is no more natural than is suicide. While suicide indicates that the individual has lost his balance and failed to adapt to a wholesome environment, war shows the same for the organized societies which engage in it.

A recent editorial in the New York *Times* points out that during 1938 the industrial nations spent a total of 18 billion dollars on armaments and that in the case of Russia and Japan the expenditure is 40 per cent of the entire national income. When it is realized how rapidly developments in design and function outmode these various engines of destruction, and that it requires four years to construct a battleship, the economic tragedy is evident. In many instances armaments are out of date almost before they are ready for use. Insofar as poverty remains a problem, its continuance can be more directly traced to war and the preparation for war than to any other cause or series of causes. We have witnessed recently a dramatic instance where an objective has been won by a threat of force without a shot being fired. It should also be observed that peoples can be impoverished and the stability of finance overthrown by the same process. The national pastime of grinning hideously at our neighbor nations in the hope of frightening them into submission becomes almost as costly in the using up of material wealth as does open warfare.

The present rate of growth in expenditures on armaments, even assuming that it were not to continue its acceleration, is such that widespread depression and economic misery would seem to be the universal prospect, without the added injury of warfare. Thus a nominal peace without overt hostilities can work almost equal financial and economic havoc with war. This fact has not been accorded general recognition. War adds the biological hardship that it ensures the destruction of the most promising human stock, after the less fit have been carefully set aside and pre-

served as potential fathers of the next generation. Mephistopheles with all his power and cunning can hardly have thought up a more ghastly jest than this.

Professor Raymond Pearl has intimated that the human race may be emulating the suicidal mass-instinct of the little lemming. This mouse-like creature is very prolific, restless, and pugnacious. At irregular intervals when they become overcrowded they are impelled by a migratory instinct and march by the tens of thousands in a straight line until they reach the sea, into which they plunge and are drowned. That there is a parallel in human conduct is a tragic thought. Yet while there is life, there is hope of a more favorable outcome than universal mass-suicide and a reversion to the Dark Ages in which the law of the jungle prevails.

For thirty years I have been reading and discussing the problem of war and peace. Of all my contacts I have not been so impressed by any as much as by the book *Political Myths and Economic Realities*. This was written in 1925 by a Frenchman, Francis Delaisi, and an English translation is in the public library. I have been so deeply impressed by the merit of this brilliant book that I have made an abstract of it. A copy may be obtained upon request, while they last.

The author points out that for three centuries there was a bloody conflict between the church and the State, and that the battle was won not by force but by the widespread acceptance of an idea. The idea was that political associations proceed horizontally among citizens, while religious affiliations act perpendicularly between each individual and his Maker. Like all profound and transforming concepts this is remarkably simple. And it resolved the terrible deadlock which had persisted so long between politics and religion.

Delaisi shows that at present there is an even more fearful impasse involving the economic and the political factors. These, he feels, should each function in its own plane and as independent of one another as are politics and religion. The international character of economics is inevitable among modern industrial nations which are everywhere greatly interdependent. During the World War the allied nations established a Supreme Economic Council which was indeed supreme in all economic matters. This was done as a measure of self-preservation under the exigencies of war. What is needed is a similar movement in the interests of mutual preservation. The machinery already exists in the International Chamber of Commerce. The political instrument, the League of Nations, has been judged a failure, but not the economic body. The latter has not failed.

There is opportunity now to make only one final quotation from Delaisi's book.

> The separation of the temporal from the spiritual brought religious wars to an end. The separation of the economic from the political will put an end to business wars. The world will only acquire equilibrium when the idea of interdependence has gained the same value as salvation for the Christian, equality for the democrat, and the Fatherland for the citizen. . . . The many nationalisms of today are like the polytheism of the Greeks at the time when Paul noticed the statue "to the unknown god." Interdependence is the one true god of economics.

The International Peace Garden

HELEN KIMBERLY McELHONE

The idea of an International Peace Garden was first brought out at a meeting of people interested in gardens, the beauty and the peace of gardens. In view of the hideous happenings that are now disrupting a world which has all the material at hand for rare natural and spiritual beauty, such a group as that, with minds attuned, together can without doubt restore at least one note of a general harmony and help to silence the painful discords of a world out of tune.

This meeting was held in the country that is our nearest neighbor, in the city of Toronto, in 1929. It was the annual convention of the National Association of Gardeners, a group of Canadian and American Horticulturists. Here, to commemorate the century of unbroken friendship between Canada and the United States, the International Garden project was launched. This Peace Garden holds a unique position among the numerous Peace organizations of the world, with 2,200 fertile acres where is under way one of the most extraordinary projects on this Continent and of this age. It is not designed to be just a park, but a garden—the Garden of Peace—the only one of its kind in the world.

The originator of the Peace Garden idea was Henry J. Moore, gardener, author, and associate member of the Royal Horticultural Society of London. The magnitude as well as the uniqueness of his proposal startled the Convention. A colossal Garden of Peace, covering hundreds of acres, and maintained through the years, flashed upon the members as a superb idea, —but could it ever become more than a delightful dream? None knew better than these veteran gardeners what such an undertaking involved. Naturally there was some hesitation, but so inspiring was the appeal, so forceful its conclusions, and so high minded the conception, that forthwith the Convention voted its unanimous approval.

"It was one of the finest challenges ever made against war and in behalf of international amity. . . . The challenge was accepted by the gardeners,—a small group of a few hundred delegates." Since that day, the challenge has been accepted by hundreds of thousands!

The location of the Peace Garden is at the geographical center of the North American Continent, with 2,200 acres, 900 in North Dakota and 1,300 in Manitoba, Canada, on the Turtle Mountains. These are not high mountains, but rather a succession of gently rolling hills that rise to about 2,500 feet above sea level, or a thousand feet above the surrounding area. They extend forty miles east and west and twenty miles north and south, about equally divided by the boundary line. Scattered among the hills and in the garden tract are several hundred fresh water lakes. The region has a greater variety of birds than may be found anywhere else in North America. Deer, grouse, and other game abound in the hills, and there is an extensive variety of trees, shrubs, and small fruits. The soil is of a rich mold, excellent for gardening, and the landscape is appealing in its diversity and

natural beauty. The setting seems to be nature's own selection for a Garden of Peace.

This is verified by the astonishing and pertinent fact that it is being developed on the soil of two great friendly nations, at peace with each other for more than a century, and on the *longest unfortified boundary line in the world!*

Immediately after the meeting in 1929, plans were made, and the actual work started very soon after. A statement in 1936 says:

> The response from the public has been marvelous. The project has received the approval of four governmental bodies,—North Dakota, Manitoba, the United States and Dominion Governments, with interest steadily increasing, until the place and the enterprise have received what might be said to be world-wide recognition. Not tax-payers' money, but individual contributions will build and maintain this garden. It is accepted as a gesture for better international relations and an indication of growing abhorrence of the old institution of war.
>
> Other nations desire the Garden of Peace to succeed. The hand of encouragement has been extended from across several boundary lines, and across oceans, with confidence in its realization. The friendly people of the Republic of Mexico see in the plan more than a novel idea, they see a world influence and wish to aid in its development. Holland has officially applied for representation. England will participate, and Australia has sent word of assured coöperation. Many national groups, scattered over the North American Continent, notably the Scots and Scandinavians, are active in its promotion. Several countries have offered gifts of bulbs, shrubs and trees.

A report in 1937 states:

> It is evident that the International Peace Garden project is now taking on large proportions. A visit to the place gives one the impression that every person there feels that he is engaged in building one of the most unique and worthy institutions ever conceived by man.

Now we have the assurance that this unique garden will be linked up with the historical monument in South America, "The Christ of the Andes," through completion of the Pan-American Highway, which, as recently announced, is to be extended to Cape Horn and thus become the world's longest road. This road, commencing in the Riding Mountains of Northern Manitoba, traverses the International Peace Garden, passes the "Center-of-the-Continent Monument," near Rugby, North Dakota, then on through the States of South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. It enters Mexico at Laredo, where it connects with the Pan-American Highway.

The statue, the "Christ of the Andes," located near the summit of the Andes Mountains, 13,000 feet above sea level and overlooking the Argentino-Chilean boundary, is a gigantic figure of Christ, twenty-six feet in height and cast of metal from molten cannons and other war materials. It stands upon a granite hemisphere five feet high and weighing fourteen tons, upon whose surface the Continents are set in bronze. More than 3,000 people climbed the heights, March 13, 1904, to witness the dedicatory ceremonies which took place amid salutes and singing of national anthems of the two countries. A boundary dispute threatening war was amicably adjusted and there has been no trouble between those countries since that day. *The pledge they made has not been broken.* It is of interest that these two great peace enterprises in behalf of international good will, nine thousand four hundred miles apart, are to be linked together by the same road, the Pan-American Highway.

Up to 1937, the actual work done included: the great dam, the artificial lake on the United States side, the Park drive, miles of graveled footpaths, and rustic foot bridges. Among the projects under way or contemplated for the near future are: the Lodge which is under construction, 105 feet long with end wing of 60 feet, the community building of similar size and type as the Lodge, the Lookout Tower, the Custodian's residence, transient cabins, water and sewer systems and wells. And from the latest report in September, 1938, the Lodge is completed, and the annual meeting of Directors was held there. The first meal, a banquet, was served in the huge dining room.

In an address by W. M. Smart of Minot, North Dakota, on behalf of the citizens of the United States, this pertinent statement in regard to the children and youth of the world was made:

> As a symbol of the friendship between Canada and the United States, this garden will someday fire the imagination of the school children of the world who can see through the folly, hypocrisy and futility of war. The stand that the Youth of our countries, and of most nations of the world, are taking today against war is the brightest spot on the international horizon.
>
> This garden will be the Mecca of unnumbered thousands of those who love the beauties of Nature and those who are moved by the purpose and spirit of Peace.

An Unexpected Benediction

All Seattle is laughing, annoyed, or praising God for a dramatic act of a Congregational minister Sunday afternoon. The new armory was being dedicated by invited religious leaders of the city. It was the climax of a three-day celebration. For weeks peace-minded ministers had tried to forestall the meeting. They had pleaded with the ministers who were to participate to withdraw. All to no avail. It devolved upon a quiet out-of-a-job pastor to turn the meeting into a terrific reprimand to the church leaders for taking part in this military program. The Reverend Louis E. Scholl was not invited to the platform. In fact, when he seated himself he was asked to leave. But he refused to budge. When Major-General O'Ryan had finished his speech, the Right Reverend Dean McLaughlan announced that Doctor Ridenour would pronounce the benediction. Before he could get to the microphone Mr. Scholl slipped up to it and said: "I shall pronounce the benediction." While the religious leaders looked their amazement and the audience sat stunned, Mr. Scholl gave this benediction, which was given on the front page in blackfaced type in the following morning's newspaper:

> We thank thee for the wisdom of the speaker, who said war is the most relentless and insidious enemy of mankind. Therefore we thank thee that Christian ministers and workers of this city have invited the people to come from their worship to give their blessings to the doctrine of war and violence as represented by this armory.
>
> Lord, we thank thee for the battleships and bombs, the airplanes and the poison gas. We thank thee that thou didst say, "Suffer little children to come unto me that I might drop bombs upon them and blow them into Kingdom Come." We thank thee that thou did'st die upon the cross, not with a crown of thorns on thy head, but with a gas mask on thy face and a soldier's boots upon thy feet.

He was denounced, of course, as being uncouth. Some hissed him. It reminds one of Amos bursting into the king's shrine at Bethel. It was the answer to a peacemaker's prayer.

Fred W. Shorter.

The Philosophy of a Community Church Pastor

CYRIL K. RICHARD*

It is not easy to give a brief definition of a Community Church, for any church is an organization and there is no standardized structural pattern for Community Churches. Some are independent, having had their beginning that way. Others are a union of two or more groups which started originally as denominations. A Union church may or may not have denominational ties. Then there is the Federated church which consists of at least two denominational groups trying to carry on many important features of each denomination under the same roof.

Some Community Churches are definitely an organic part of a denomination. That is, some Community Churches bear the name, and work well within the frame work, of a denomination. Some will ask how a denominational church can be called a Community Church. The answer is that the feature which classifies a church as "Community" is found in its functional practices and philosophy. A Community Church is such by virtue of the relation it maintains to the natural area in which it is located.

The first important characteristic of a Community Church is that it functions on a neighborhood basis. Its contributions to the life of its community are direct, personal, and inclusive. It conceives its mission to be that of integrating, ordering, and lifting life. It does not function on a basis of the ancient "Come out of it" theology. Rather it thinks of itself as a nucleus of life-building influences that radiate from it into the neighborhood through every available channel. With this conception of its rôle in society, the Community Church develops its organization as a means to this end. With the disintegration and purposelessness which characterizes so strongly modern urban life, a church can hardly function with justifiable efficiency except on a neighborhood, seven-day-a-week, family basis.

Old line churches can be found all over Chicago stranded and isolated ecologically by the steady shift of national, racial, and cultural populations. Their members are scattered far and wide, and it is only an institutional loyalty, largely denominational, that pulls them back on Sunday and for other special services. Even before the original members of these churches begin to die off, the church enters into decline, to be supported by missionary revenue, eventually to close down or be taken over by the new cultural group in its natural area. Some continue with endowments.

A Community Church is an organic part of the life processes within its neighborhood. This organic relationship is frequently deepened when the church is independent and depends solely upon its community for financial support. A real Community Church is not just an institution with a street number.

The preceding statement has brought us to the second functional characteristic of a Community Church, which is that its first loyalty is to its community and not to a denomination. This is definitely necessary if a church would really serve its neighborhood well. The church which puts allegiance to the traditions and mores of a denomination before life, cannot make the adjustments in its total functional pattern necessary to adapt itself to the dynamic processes of modern life. This is one of the obvious facts that affect the church today, and an increasing number of people—a few pastors and more laymen—are recognizing it and beginning to act accordingly.

If any new community were given the opportunity, through a fair cross section of its families, to select the kind of church it wanted, the age of denominational expansion would be over. I am not fully acquainted with the procedure for surveys in new areas, but I feel that the only fair method would be to conduct them on a completely disinterested and non-denominational basis with a place on the instrument for families to state not only their denominational background, but their preference for a church, with "Community Church" listed with the denominational names.

In the third place, a Community Church is interested as much, if not more, in the current life-needs of people as in traditional theologies and ritualism. In other words, a Community Church is less a historical museum than a laboratory searching for methods and techniques for the elevation and enrichment of life.

At this point I would like to comment on the general attitude of the Community Church movement toward denominationalism. To begin with, let it be stated that we are not anti-denominational. I believe most of us agree that not everything which characteristically belongs to denominationalism is bad. But even if this were not true our movement is not "anti." Community Church pastors, as a rule, are not afflicted with a persecution complex. They are too busy trying to make their respective churches vital and effective. I have known numerous denominational men who in private were strongly anti-denominational. Here and there individual Community Church pastors are resentful toward denominations, but as a whole the movement is not. Moreover, we are not more interested in unity and church consolidation, where desirable, than in working out a new pattern for local church effectiveness.

The Community Church movement is neither anti nor pro denominational. As we have already indicated it is based upon a Christian philosophy that, at points, moves within the traditional denominational forms of Christianity, and at points cuts through them. But most important of all, the Community Church movement leads beyond denominationalism in certain definite ways. First, in its inclusive fellowship! Second, by the application of democratic principles to Christian life and work. Dictators, benevolent and otherwise, profess that their government is for the people. Democratic government is not only *for* the people, but *of* and *by* the people. Third, by its tolerance and appreciation of the various religious backgrounds which people bring with them into church life. Each brings in his best and takes out what he needs, spiritually speaking.

The Community Church workers welcome any move toward Christian coöperation, regardless of where it may be initiated, with the right motives. Needless to say, they are in hearty accord with the work of the Chicago Church Federation, and especially that of the Comity Commission. In return for the recognition given Community Churches in the Chicago region by

*Minister of the Sauganash Community Church, Chicago. A statement made to the Comity Commission of the Chicago Church Federation. —*Editor.*

the Federation in allowing us a representative on the Comity Commission, our increasing coöperation and support may be assured.

The need of an adaptation of the religious resources for our generation constitutes a threefold challenge to the bravest minds and most sincere spirits among us. First, to socialize the function of the church. We are not referring directly to the commonplace and conventional church dinner and social party, although they still have their place as a means of tying the church more closely into the lives of the people. Rather we are thinking of something far more fundamental, namely that of making the church an institution that conceives its task as being within the framework of life here and now—a religious force working in the social process, measuring its work by the full needs of the people.

The second challenge is for us to humanize our thinking and our theology. We are not arguing that mysticism and supernatural hypotheses do not have a place in man's life, such as in the creation of aesthetics. But, without going into a discussion of the subjects here, it is enough to recognize that human happiness depends upon proper adjustment to other levels of life as well: the biological, psychological, and economic levels.

It is not enough to believe in God. God has meaning for man only as man discovers what God means in life. Reverie, piety, and prayer alone are not safe devices for discovering what God means in life. Reason, history, statistics, scientific research must be drawn upon if anything more than good intentions is to become operative in the religious approach to life at its best. Faith or credulity is not enough by itself.

The third challenge is to create a symbolism adequate for the scientific era in which man now lives. This is a day that calls for writers of new hymns—hymn writers who can set to tune stirring images and thoughts capable of inspiring an urban civilization. Hymns that sing of a new earth, that relate God to the democratic organization of society, whose inspiring imagery invokes not Israel nor Jerusalem, but visions of a greater America and Chicago. God as a shepherd has not the remotest tie-up to the experiences of the office worker in a skyscraper. If God is to become real to city people today he must be symbolized with an imagery that touches the experiences men have with machines, marts of merchandise, elevated trains, cosmic rays, serums, suburbs, etc. And not only hymns that speak to men of the age about ultimate meanings in terms of their own experiences, but liturgies and orders of worship also need to be developed that will likewise have new power to kindle imaginations and clothe the facts of contemporary life with meaning, assurance, and understanding.

The Study Table

The Mind—A Verbal Ghost

THE LOGIC OF MODERN PSYCHOLOGY. *By Carroll C. Pratt. 185 pp. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.00.*

"Psychology is supposed to be, at least etymologically, the study of the mind. Within a strict, scientific universe of discourse, however, there is no such thing as mind—at least, not with a capital 'm.' In everyday conversation the word is useful enough, in spite [Dare we interpolate: *'because'*] of its gaudy ambiguity of meaning; but in scientific language, except as a short-cut expression, it has no defensible place. Its career would almost be enough to rule it out. In the beginning, mind was inextricably bound up with theological verbiage, but by the middle of last century it had completely lost its soul at the hands of those who were trying to establish a scientific psychology. During the early years of the present century it began to lose consciousness under the blows of behaviorism. Finally, at the present time, even its behavior is questionable. Nay, more, its very existence is in doubt. Endowed in youth with a wealth of meaning, it comes to the end of its days in abject poverty. In scientific circles its death will not be mourned; it will go the way of countless other concepts too lacking in vitality to carry on. Outside of scientific circles, mind will never die. It will live on, a verbal ghost, useful in conversation and pleasant to the ear; but for all scientific intents and purposes the concept has already outlived its usefulness."

There, now you have it! You know the truth at last. Or shall we say, at the outset? Through some hundred and eighty witty, trenchant pages, Dr. Carroll C. Pratt, the head of the Department of Psychology at Rutgers University, himself a laboratory research scientist, with a previous book on the meaning of music to his credit, performs for us the autopsy and describes the graveyard and the tombstone of this so precious entity, the mind. He buries it deep—Oh very deep!—as the following extracts from his book will prove: "No philosopher or psychologist has ever been able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of more than a limited number of followers that the events and objects of this world can be unequivocably divided into two basically different categories, mental and physical." "Psychical Monism can have no meaning at a critical level until it can be shown what is meant by saying that knowledge comes through the mind. It may be that mind is not mental." And he quotes Tolman: "I am a behaviorist. I hold that psychology does not seek descriptions and intercommunications concerning immediate experience, per se," and it is not fair to criticise Behaviorism on the ground "that it just fails to express the vital, personal quality of experience." S. S. Stevens, with his "Discriminatory Response," is called up to testify that "Scientific Psychology is operational and as such can have nothing to do with any private or inner experience, for the simple reason that an operation for permeating privacy is self-contradictory." Which resolves itself, in the end, under Doctor Pratt's biting satire and withering logic, into saying that the ideas of Plato and Aristotle, to all scientific intents and purposes, equal so much tonal density. This, I suppose, in a way, is true!

For his own testimony, Doctor Pratt insists that the fundamental *nature* of an observational datum is of no concern to psychology. Only the consistency with which it is reported has any value. "All 'correct' scientific explanations turn out to be nothing more than statements of observed correlations." "Correlations are nothing more than items observed in particular relations. An observed relation is not a force or a

power, a will or a purpose. Therefore inferences should not contain any meaning [especially hidden meaning] that implies the action of some power or purpose." (Even our own!) "The history of psychology is shot through with animistic concepts, soul, will, faculty, creative synthesis, attention, volition, conation, intent, psychic energy, determination, purpose, need, wish, motive, incentive, urge, drive, etc., to which no meaning can be ascribed that has any dynamic, explanatory power." But "the only sure knowledge man can ever have will be contained within the structure of science. Other kinds of 'knowledge' may be more useful, more practical as a guide to conduct, more satisfying aesthetically, more comforting in times of need or distress; but none will be as exact as that possessed by science." "The observed correlations to which psychologists can point with pride are based largely on studies of sensation and reflex action and do not meet the urgent needs of a confused society, whereas the assumed correlations, which the psychologist must view with alarm, abounding in words like repression, super-ego, regnancy, and dynamic stresses, seem full of vital significance." Therefore, "Dynamic Psychologists seem to entertain the naive belief, or, rather, they are entertained by the belief, that the kind of correlations in which they are especially interested acquire dynamic qualities [whatever these may be] as a result of some sort of verbal magic." Which leads me to wonder if it would not be correct to assume that Doctor Pratt considers the work of many psychologists to have been severely cluttered and befogged by their inability to keep their mind *off* it!

Well, "Weep for Adonais, He is dead!" And what shall we do, now that psychology, which we set the task of investigating the mind, severely rejects the task? Invent a new science to deal with our inner workings? Or return those sacred precincts to the keeping of mystical religion and begin again to treat our own souls (and our neighbors') with reverence and awe, as before the unknowable but the dimly comprehended?

But Doctor Pratt, himself, gives us an "out." "The theses of these pages," he says, "is to defend not exactly the opposite of the correlationists, but a strikingly different emphasis. Material properties are of little importance in and of themselves. The formal properties [by which he means the things which we infer from the data of matter] which the material properties define are the important concern of science." And every message from our senses, every protocol from observation, is colored, by just so much, from the "interpretation" needed to observe and report it. "No theory can be formulated, no generalization made, which does not leave first observation at least a few steps behind." And these "formal constructions, since they supply missing items, have an explanatory capacity which incomplete material properties do not possess." And, in spite of logical difficulties, "the formulation of hypotheses is clearly one of the most valuable methods for trying to decide in advance what items are worth careful examination." "Attempts to eliminate certain kinds of data from observation on the grounds that they are too subjective or insufficiently objective, will bog psychology down into a morass of ontological nonsense." And again, "It is unfortunately true that much of human nature still eludes experimental straitjackets. Why not in all honesty let this fact be fully recognized, instead of allowing the public to suppose that in some miraculous way psychology has cleared up the mystery of mind?" But "in the last analysis scientific truth is always arrived at by observation and experiment. . . . The items used in the hypothesis require a location having spatiotemporal characteristics. The region inside the biological organism has these characteristics, and although the events which take place in this region that are most important for psychology are still obscure, there is no intrinsic reason for believing that they will not eventually be known."

So perhaps there is to be a Resurrection, after all, from the very grave of the slain God. And if we can keep Doctor Pratt around as high priest and angel herald to tell us about it, we are sure of at least one more readable, chuckly, and enlivening book in the field of modern psychology.

JULIA N. BUDLONG.

A French Revolution Drama

MARIE ANTOINETTE. *A Play by Upton Sinclair. Published by Upton Sinclair, Pasadena, California. $1.50.*

Marie Antoinette is still conspicuous in the literary field. Like her sister in royal tragedy, Mary Queen of Scots, she is a subject of perennially fascinating interest. It was only recently that Stefan Zweig published his superb biographical study of the French Queen. Upton Sinclair had no sooner finished his play than he heard of another just written and produced in Paris. There will be no end of these works, for such a woman in such an historical setting must ever hold fast the attention of mankind.

Sinclair's play is not so much a play, in the close-knit dramatic sense, as a succession of scenes chosen out of the great and terrible pageant of Marie Antoinette's career. Beginning with the entrance of the little Austrian Princess into France to marry the Dauphin, Louis, it ends with the execution of the Queen on the scaffold, with one final scene depicting the violent death of her lover, Count Ferson. The various scenes are connected with chorus effects, after the pattern of old Greek tragedy, conveying the atmosphere of the marching events of history.

The central theme of the play is the romance of Marie and her Swedish Count. This is presented with poignant sympathy and much beauty. Around it turn the trivialities of the French court, the restive misery of the common people, the outbreak of revolution, and the doom that walks in the pathway of kings at such a time. The scenes are excellently done, and the characterization has precision and understanding. Count Ferson is something of a lay figure—a kind of Sir Walter Scott hero. But Marie Antoinette is a vital personality, and the loutish Louis XVI is sketched with master strokes. The author is clever in bringing into his text various references to America which help to give current reality to the drama for American readers.

Upton Sinclair has written plays before, but none better than this.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Competition

Come let us profit by the war,
And hasten guns and planes to sell!
Another might get there before,
And find a quicker way to Hell.

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE.

Correspondence

The Case of Miss Banker

Editor of UNITY:

I am sorry Elizabeth C. Banker lives so far away. I would like to meet her. Her letter is an apt illustration of how, in these troubled times, intelligent people can read the same things and get widely different impressions from what they read.

Miss Banker must be intelligent because she has read UNITY for five years, and by the same token I am, because I have read UNITY for sixty years. I have known most of the men and women who fathered and mothered little UNITY sixty years ago, at nine years of age. I did not know what it was all about but in time I did, just as in time the Editor-in-Chief became a dear friend.

The Board of Trustees selected you, Mr. Editor, as the one best fitted to carry on the burden Mr. Jones had to relinquish at death. To us who have cherished the ideals of UNITY for Freedom, Fellowship, and Character in Religion, you have seemed to keep UNITY free from bitterness and bigotry, above the 'ists, 'isms, and 'izes.

As you came to carry UNITY on just after the World War, perhaps you did not know that UNITY was locked up for two years as unfit to go through the mail. The first charge was because of the Beatitudes Mr. Jones dared to print on the front page. The guardian of mails in Chicago declared the Beatitudes were not in any Bible he had ever read. The second issue banned had nothing worse in it than Mr. Gannett's article explaining why he could not agree with men, like Mr. Jones, who were uncompromising pacifists. Dear Mr. Gannett was too attuned to love and brotherhood to be a convincing advocate of any other course. The thing that settled the fate of UNITY was a review of the "Browning Class" study of Sordello. "Nothing from that man Browning shall go through and no publication that prints anything from Browning who by his own words is no patriot, deserves the liberty of the U. S. mails."

I am just telling you, Mr. Editor, what to expect if we are too stupid to have learned anything from the last war and insist on fighting. Strange guardians of public intelligence come forth. Nothing that appeals to reason or love or the human way will be permitted, only war propaganda, a mixture of hate and lies and lust for power.

I rejoice that your sense of humor has not deserted you. Some of us who can no longer laugh alone can laugh with you but in time of war a sense of humor may land you in Leavenworth.

With your tendency to jump in to help the misunderstood and oppressed, save enough of your strength to help yourself and all others who still believe in the Jesus way and the Gandhi way—the way UNITY was founded and endowed to travel. That precious small word religion holds UNITY above the battles.

Coral Cables, Florida. O. C. S.

A Friendly Complaint

Editor of UNITY:

I, too, like Miss Banker, have been disappointed by the editorial policy of UNITY for the past three or four years. An editorial regarding A.A.A. in the February 3rd, 1936, issue, also one on Purges, June 20th, 1938, I considered atrocious. The very idea of comparing the President, in his desire to see liberal-minded men sent to Congress who would assist in conserving humanity rather than property, to the blood-letting dictators of Europe. But after all UNITY has a lot of good wholesome reading matter that I do not want to pass up and which far overbalances the few odious editorials. The editorial writer himself can still write classical articles which are mightily worth-while.

Enclosed is $9.00 to renew subscriptions for two friends and myself.

El Monte, California. ISAAC F. BAKER.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 82)

Unitarian Summer Services in New York

As hundreds of thousands of visitors stream into New York for a glimpse of the World of Tomorrow, the Unitarian Church will greet its followers and friends with a special program of Summer services that may point the way toward the liberal religion of the future. The meetings will be held for thirteen consecutive weeks beginning June 18, at Town Hall, 123 West 43rd Street.

Both out-of-town residents and New Yorkers will be welcome. The series has been arranged through the Unitarian Regional Headquarters as a joint project of the American Unitarian Association and the Community Church of New York.

Well-known speakers from all parts of the country will deliver sermons on a variety of subjects. Soloists of outstanding talent will be presented under a unique plan of "auditions" for youthful artists. Clifford Demarest, who has been the organist of the Community Church for many years, will serve in that capacity during the Summer months.

Following each service, the members of the congregation will have an opportunity to meet again at a nearby restaurant for Sunday dinner. The speaker of the day will be present and an informal discussion of the sermon topic will be possible in friendly and companionable surroundings. Town Hall, center for the city's leading cultural events, is conveniently located in the very heart of the city.

First speaker on June 18 will be Dr. Frederick May Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association, with Dr. Minot Simons, minister of the All Souls Church of New York, presiding. This will be Unitarian Sunday, and all the Unitarian churches in the metropolitan area—which includes the city proper, Westchester, Long Island, and Northern New Jersey—are being invited to join. There are about twenty in this section, and their ministers will be asked to sit on the platform.

On June 25, the Reverend Raymond Bragg, minister of the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis, will speak. A Service of World Faiths, arranged with the coöperation of the World Fellowship of Faiths, is expected to be of keen interest to hundreds of liberally-minded men and women, on July 2.

For five Sundays, from July 9 to August 6, John Haynes Holmes, minister of the Community Church of New York and one of the nation's most popular liberals, will conduct the services and preach the sermon. On August 13, the Reverend David Rhys Williams, minister of the First Unitarian Society of Rochester, will be the speaker, and on August 27, Rabbi Edward L. Israel of the Har Sinai Congregation in Baltimore will preach. The Reverend Walton E. Cole, minister of the First Unitarian Church of Toledo, Ohio, will deliver the sermon on September 3, and Dr. Minot Simons will speak on September 10.

The committee in charge of the services, which are expected to dramatize the Unitarian theme of worshiping God in religious freedom, includes Frederic G. Melcher, John Haynes Holmes, D.D., Norman D. Fletcher, D.D., Charles Strong, and George E. Moesel. The Reverend Dale DeWitt, regional director of the Association in the middle Atlantic States, is chairman of the committee.

Unitarian offices in Suite 8-A, at 10 Park Avenue, New York, will be open during the Summer for any services which may be rendered to Unitarians visiting the city.

Young People's Conference

The Great Lakes Federation of the Young Peoples Religious Union is holding its annual Dunes Conference at Bridgman, Michigan, June 16-19. Mr. Ashley Rolfe of Chicago is the chairman of the Dunes Committee.

The topic for discussion at the conference will be, "The Importance of Living." The conference speakers will be as follows: Reverend Rudolph W. Gilbert, Minister of the Unitarian Church of Bloomington, Illinois, Dr. Charles H. Lyttle, Professor of Church History in the Meadville Theological School, and the Reverend Edwin C. Palmer, Minister of the Unitarian Church of Kalamazoo, Mich.

The fees for the conference are fifty cents a unit, (a unit is one meal or one overnight stop), and the registration fee is $1.00, payable in advance.

A well-organized program, including three campfire services, tennis tournaments, baseball games, swimming, and hiking, will provide plenty of strenuous exercise for those who wish it. Those who wish rest and relaxation will find the Dunes suited to their needs.

Write to Robert W. Lawson, Business Mgr., 5704 Maryland Ave., Chicago, Ill., for further information.